

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginsa 22313-1450 www.msplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/492,725	01/27/2000	Robert G. Arsenault	PD-980142	1296		
	7590 05/19/200 V GROUP, INC.	EXAN	EXAMINER			
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION CA /LAI / A109 2230 E. IMPERIAL HIGHWAY			JANVIER	JANVIER, JEAN D		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
EL SEGUNDO), CA 90245	3688				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			05/19/2009	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/492,725	ARSENAULT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JEAN JANVIER	3688	

	JEAN JANVIER	3688					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. Me The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 766.07?	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mnliant Amendment (PTOL=324)				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpilane / unonamone (102 02-1).				
	6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling th						
7. If or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
05/15/09	/Jean Janvier/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3688					

Continuation of 13. Other: First, the "General Comment" section is set forth to put the Applicant on notice regarding certain aspects of the claimed invention. It is not a rejection. Second, the request by the Applicant that the Examiner provide "documentary evidence" in support of the "Official Notice" or the challenge to the "Official Notice" is improper since the Applicant has herein failed to point out any deficiencies in the Official Notice based on the current state of the art or based on Applicant's own background. Because the Applicant does not like the "Official Notice" does not necessarily make it wrong or improper. Simply requesting documentary evidence in support of an "Official Notice", without pointing out any deficiency therein, is improper. Further, it appears that the Applicant argues, in ter alia, that those materials cited in the "Office Action" were not available at the time of the invention. However, personal computer technology was available well before 03/29/1999, the effective filing date of the Instant Application. As described in the "Official Notice", file format compatibility is as old as personal computer technology itself. The latter is evidence that the argued limitation was available or in practice before the claimed invention. Additionally, it is customary in the art to broadcast TV signals (audio/visual signals) that can be received by radio receivers, wherein some receivers or radio receivers are configured to display images/objects related to the signals on the receiver screens while playing the accompanied audio components (like on regular TV receivers) and wherein other (radio) receivers, having no screens, can only select the related audio components for playing.